

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 15-18 and 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 15-18 are amended and claim 20 is added. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-5, 15 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate." Claims 8, 16 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined element in a hierarchy of the subject name represents a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate." New claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an organizational unit name allocated for representing a project name and a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation of the project." Support for these claims may be found throughout the specification. For example, specific support may be found at Fig. 6; Fig. 7; original claims 3 and 7; and page 11, lines 11-21.

**I. §102(e) Rejection**

Claims 1-4, 8-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,088,805 to Davis et al. ("Davis"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 4-5, 15 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate." Claims 8, 16 and 18 recite, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined element in a hierarchy of the subject name represents a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate." Applicant respectfully submits that Davis does not disclose, teach or suggest such a feature.

The Office Action rejects claim 3, stating that Davis discloses that the predetermined elements are an organizational unit name of one hierarchy allocated for representing a project name and a part of a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation (Col. 7, lines 12-30; Col. 9, lines 1-10). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Davis does not disclose or suggest an element allocated for representing a "purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate," as recited in the claims.

Davis discloses organization name and sub-field organization unit name such as "IBM" and "Human Resources" (Col. 7, lines 12-30). Furthermore, Davis discloses the name of the organization to which the client belongs (Col. 9, lines 1-10). However, Davis does not disclose an element allocated for representing "a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate" disclosed in our invention. Therefore, Davis can distinguish the person who belongs to a specific organization, but cannot distinguish the person who operates a specific operation which is operated for a specific purpose. A person belonging to an organization and a person who operates a specific operation for a specific purpose are not necessarily identical.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 15-18 are patentably distinguishable over Davis. Claims 2, 6 and 9-11 depend from independent claims 1, 5 and 8, respectfully, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Davis for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

## **II. §103 Rejection of claims 5-7**

The Office Action rejects claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent 5,884,312 to Dustan et al. ("Dustan). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 7 has been cancelled and claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein

the predetermined elements includes an element allocated for representing a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate."

The Office Action cites, in the Office Action rejecting claim 7, that the Davis/Dustan combination discloses that the predetermined elements are an organizational unit name of one hierarchy allocated for representing a project name and a part of a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation (Col. 7, lines 12-30; Col. 9, lines 1-10). However, Applicant respectfully submits that that Davis/Dustan does not disclose or even suggest an element allocated for representing a "purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate," as recited in claim 5.

Davis discloses an organization name and sub-field organization unit name such as "IBM" and "Human Resources" (Col. 7, lines 12-30). Furthermore, Davis/Dustan discloses the name of the organization to which the client belongs (Col. 9, lines 1-10). However, Davis/Dustan does not disclose an element allocated for representing "a purpose of operation to be operated by the holder of the personal certificate disclosed in our invention." Therefore, Davis/Dustan can distinguish the person who belongs to a specific organization, but cannot distinguish the person who operates a specific operation which is operated for a specific purpose. A person belonging to an organization and a person who operates a specific operation for a specific purpose are not necessarily identical.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinguishable over Davis/Dustan. Claim 6 depends from independent claim 5 and is likewise patentably distinguishable over Davis/Dustan for at least its dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features it recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. New Claim**

Independent claim 20 has been added. New claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the predetermined elements includes an organizational unit name allocated for representing a project name and a common name allocated for representing a purpose of operation of the project."

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as presented above with respect to claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11 and 15-18.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 15-18 and 20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff  
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JMH/cfr

Date: October 18, 2004

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--